IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 26, line 12, with the following amended paragraph:

C1

-- The following data was generated from two distillate fuels. The first one, Example 6, was prepared in a commercial hydrodesulfurization unit from a virgin distillate feed using a conventional $CoMo/Al_2O_3$ catalyst and represents a typical commercial diesel fuel composition. The second one, Example 7, is a composition according to the present invention, as set forth in Table 1. The properties of these two fuels are shown in Table 4 below. --

Please replace Table 4, page 26, beginning at line 18, bridging to page 27, with the following amended Table 4:

C2

Table 4

	Example 6	Example 7
Sulfur (wppm)	400	61
Mono-aromatics (% wt)	19.26	21.38
Polynuclear aromatics (% wt)	4.84	1.74
Total aromatics (% wt)	24.10	23.12
Aromatics/PNAs	5.0	13.3
Density (kg/m^3)	844.1	838.8
Cetane No.	55.8	56.5
T_{95} (°C)	337.0	335.1

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 27, line 4, with the following amended paragraph:

C3

-- These fuels were run in a fleet of 3 light-duty diesel vehicles encompassing traditional and modern technology, i.e., one with distributor pump technology, one with common rail fuel injection technology and one with electronic unit injector technology. Each fuel was tested three times in each vehicle (a total of nine tests per fuel) comprising a cold-start legislated European type certification drive cycle (ECE + EUDC) in order to determine average particulate emissions and average NOx emissions for both fuels. These average values were then compared to the predicted values for both fuels in accordance with the European Programme on Emissions, Fuel and Engine (EPEFE) technologies and the AutoOil equation for the effect of sulfur to determine the expected performance of the fuels now used. The EPEFE program is based on an established set of equations from testing of 11 diesel fuels in 19 vehicles to predict the emissions performance of a fleet of vehicles based upon the fuel parameters: cetane No., density and polycyclic aromatic content. On the basis of the differences in fuel parameters between Example 6 and Example 7, the EPEFE calculations would lead one to expect lower particulate matter and NOx emissions for the fuel of Example 7. --

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 27, line 20, bridging to page 28, with the following amended paragraph:

C4

-- The results shown in Table 5 below show the average difference between the predicted reduction in emissions obtained from the EPEFE calculations and the observed reduction in average emissions for the fuel of Example 7 vs. the fuel of Example 6. Surprisingly, the data indicate that the reduction in NOx and particulate matter emissions achieved using the fuel compositions of the present invention (Example 7) were substantially greater than that predicted for any of the 19 vehicles used in the EPEFE

C4

program as well as being significantly lower than the EPEFE fleet average. In table 5, as in table 7 below, negative percentages indicate an emissions performance improvement.

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 28, line 3, with the following amended paragraph:

Table 5. EPEFE/AutoOil predictions and actual fleet measurements for Example 7 emissions vs. Example 6 emissions(%)

C5

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 29, line 28, with the following amended paragraph:

The fuel of Example 6 was also compared to another fuel of the present invention, Example 8. Table 6 below shows the properties of these fuels.

C6

Please replace Table 6, page 30, beginning at line 1, with the following amended Table 6.

Table 6

C7

	Example 6	Example 8
Sulfur (wppm)	400	14
Mono-aromatics (% wt)	19.26	20.09
Polynuclear aromatics (% wt)	4.84	1.19
Total aromatics (% wt)	24.10	21.28
Aromatics/PNAs	5.0	17.9
Density (kg/m^3)	844.1	843.0
Cetane No.	55.8	56.8
T_{95} (°C)	337.0	336.9

USSN 09/553,108
Atty. Docket No. GJH-0017

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 30, line 11, with the following amended paragraph:

The fuels were run in a single light-duty diesel vehicle with common rail fuel injection technology. Each fuel was tested 3 times, where a test constituted a cold-start legislated European type certification drive cycle (ECE+EUDC). The relative emissions levels achieved from the Example 8 fuel tests (relative to Example 6) were evaluated and compared with established EPEFE and AutoOil predictions, as in the comparison between the fuels of Examples 7 and 6. The results, shown in Table 7 below, indicate that for average particulate matter and NOx emissions the reduction achieved for the fuel of Example 8 was unexpected as it was greater than that predicted for any of the 19 vehicles used in the EPEFE program, as well as being significantly lower than the EPEFE fleet average.

C8

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 31, line 1, with the following amended paragraph:

Table 7. EPEFE / AutoOil predictions and actual fleet measurements for Example 8 emissions relative to Example 6 emissions (%)

C9